



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,854	02/06/2002	Jon S. McCarty	2500P	9424

7590 02/09/2005
Sawyer Law Group LLP
P. O. Box 51418
Palo Alto, CA 94303

EXAMINER

SCHLAIFER, JONATHAN D

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2178

DATE MAILED: 02/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/072,854	Applicant(s) MCCARTY ET AL.	
	Examiner Jonathan D. Schlaifer	Art Unit 2178	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 February 2002.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Application 10/072,852, filed on 2/6/2002.

No prior art was filed with the application.

2. Claims 1-17 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 9, and 14-17 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. **Claims 1 and 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by**

“Laura Lemay’s Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 In 14 Days:

Professional Reference Edition, Second Edition” by Laura Lemay, 1997, by Sams.

net publishing, hereinafter Lemay.

4. **Regarding independent claim 1**, Lemay discloses on page 320 that there are different colors used for URLs that have been accessed as opposed to those that have not been accessed. This inherently implies a method of managing outdated URLs in a computing system (the clicked-on/not-clicked on factor is managed), comprising: examining a state stamp flag included in a URL (the URL inherently must include a flag containing its state so that the color can be displayed); and if the state stamp flag indicates that the URL is fresh, then performing both a complementary operation and a navigational operation (only if the link is fresh will the color be changed) otherwise, performing only the

navigational operation (if not, the color has been changed and the link will only be used to navigate).

5. **Regarding independent claim 14**, it is a computing system that performs the method of claim 1 and it is rejected under similar rationale.
6. **Regarding independent claim 15**, Lemay discloses on page 320 that there are different colors used for URLs that have been accessed as opposed to those that have not been accessed. This inherently implies a method of managing outdated links in a computing system (some are outdated, some are not) comprising: examining a user status of a user and a Web application status of a Web application (this is inherent to ordinary browser operation); generating a state stamp based on the user status and the Web application status(the clicked-on/not-clicked on factor is managed); updating the state stamp each time that the either the user status changes or the Web application status changes(the clicked-on/not-clicked on factor is managed); generating a Web page, the Web page displaying a plurality of URLs(this is inherent to ordinary browser operation); incorporating the updated state stamp into each URL, of the plurality of URLs(the clicked-on/not-clicked on factor is managed); receiving a first URI, to a second Web page, the first URL selected by the user and incorporating a first state stamp, the first URL storing instructions to perform a navigational operation and an complementary operation (as a fresh URL, it will contain instructions to navigate and change color); comparing the first state stamp with a most current value of the updated state stamp (the stamp regulates the color change); and if the first state stamp matches the most current value of the update state stamp, then performing the navigational and the complementary

operation and if the updated state stamp is more recent than the first state stamp(the stamp regulates the color change); then performing the navigational operation and not performing the complementary operation (stale links don't change color).

7. **Regarding independent claim 16**, it is a variant of claim 1 whose essential variant is that there is a state stamp that is managed, but this is inherent to Lemay as presented to reject claim 1, and hence claim 16 is rejected in a manner analogous to claim 1.
8. **Regarding independent claim 17**, it is a variant of claim 16 that is functionally equivalent to claim 16 and is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. **Claim 2 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemay, further in view of King et al. (USPN 5,895,471—filing date 12/22/1997), hereinafter King.**
10. **Regarding dependent claim 2**, Lemay discloses receiving a URL (this is inherent to transmitting a URL in a browser, which is alluded to in Lemay), the URL including the state stamp flag (this is inherent to maintaining whether the link has been clicked on), a URL state stamp (this is necessary to hold the flag). Lemay fails to disclose a session identifier that identifies a user session. However, King discloses in col. 7, lines 1-20 the

use of session identifiers to identify user sessions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a session identifier as in King in the invention of Lemay because it is a necessary part of session authentication.

11. **Regarding independent claim 9**, it is a server that performs the functionality of the methods of claims 1 and 2 and is rejected under similar rationale.
12. **Regarding dependent claim 10**, Lemay and King fail to disclose a database to store the stored state stamp, the database being coupled to the interface, the server page, and the session management engine. However, it was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention that databases could have been used to store information and coupled to other aspects of a web interface in order to provide a robust, reliable means of storing information. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used a database in order to provide a robust, reliable means of storing information.
13. **Regarding dependent claim 11**, this claim includes limitations that are analogous to limitations from claim 2 and are rejected under similar rationale.
14. **Claims 3-8 and 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lemay, further in view of King, further in view of Shi et al. (USPN 5,875,296—filing date 1/28/1997), hereinafter Shi.**
15. **Regarding dependent claim 3**, Lemay and King fail to disclose determining whether the user session is authenticated. However, Shi, in col. 3, lines 20-50 describes ascertaining whether the session is authenticated in order to use cookies successfully. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to determine

whether the session is authenticated in Lemay and King in the manner of Shi in order to increase the capabilities of Lemay and King by using cookies to facilitate persistent information transferral.

16. **Regarding dependent claim 4**, Lemay and King fail to disclose if the user session is not authenticated, then re-authenticating the user session, and updating a stored state stamp. However, Shi, in col. 3, lines 20-50 describes if the user session is not authenticated then re-authenticating the user session and updating a stored state stamp (this is how the session is managed via cookies). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to re-authenticate the user session and updating a stored state stamp in order to use cookies successfully.
17. **Regarding dependent claim 5**, Lemay and King fail to disclose determining whether the URL state stamp matches the stored state stamp. However, Shi, in col. 3, lines 20-50 (see especially 30-35; when the URL state stamp is used as a login profile such comparison occurs) discloses a determination of whether the URL state stamp matches the stored state stamp. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to check the URL state stamp against the stored state stamp in order to use it as a login protocol.
18. **Regarding dependent claim 6**, Lemay and King fail to disclose if the URL state stamp does not match the stored state stamp, then adjusting the state stamp flag to indicate that the URL is stale; executing the URL; and performing the act of examining. However, Shi processes cookies according to the flags associated with them, adjusts the flags, and executes and examines the URLs in col. 3, lines 20-50. It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to adjust the state stamp flag, execute the URL, and examine the URL

19. **Regarding dependent claim 7**, Lemay and King fail to disclose if the URL state stamp matches the stored state stamp, then updating a stored state stamp; executing the URL and performing the act of examining. However, Shi processes cookies according to the flags associated with them, adjusts the flags, and executes and examines the URLs in col. 3, lines 20-50. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to update the state stamp flag, execute the URL, and examine the URL
20. **Regarding dependent claim 8**, Lemay and King fail to disclose creating HTML files to send to a client to form a Web page at the client, the HTML files including a sent URL; incorporating the stored state stamp and a sent state stamp flag into the sent URL; adjusting the sent state stamp flag to indicate that the URL is fresh. However, Shi in col. 3, lines 20-50 (see especially lines 20-35) discloses compiling an HTTP request comprising of HTML that adjust state flags. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use HTTP requests comprised of HTML that adjust state flags because it would facilitate user interactivity for the state flag process.
21. **Regarding dependent claim 12**, Lemay and King fail to disclose that the session management engine determines whether the user session is authenticated, and, if the user session is not authenticated, re-authenticates the user session and updates the stored state stamp. However, this limitation is analogous to claims 3 and 4 and is rejected in a similar manner in view of Shi.

22. Regarding dependent claim 13, Lemay and King fail to disclose that the server according to claim 12, wherein if the session management engine compares the URL state stamp with the stored state stamp and the URL state stamp does not match the stored state stamp, then the session management engine adjust the state stamp flag to indicate that the URL is stale, otherwise the session management engine updates the stored state stamp. However, this limitation is analogous to claims 6 and 7 and is rejected in a similar manner in view of Shi.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

USPN 5,961,601 (filing date 6/7/1996)—Iyengar

USPN 6,611,835 (filing date 5/4/2000)—Huang et al.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jonathan D. Schlaifer whose telephone number is (571) 272-4129. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JS


STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER